



CCR Education Sub-Workgroup Meeting

February 28, 2017

Meeting Notes

744 P St., Sacramento, CA 95814, OB9 Room 205

Purpose: To discuss how education system (the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), Foster Youth Services and General Education) interplays with Child Welfare, Probation and Mental Health systems in the implementation of CCR.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
I. Welcome and Introductions Stuart Oppenheim , Child and Family Policy Institute of California (CFPIC)/ Ahmed Nemr , California Department of Social Services (CDSS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants: (in-person and via phone) • Breaking Barriers: Maureen Burness; • CA Dept. of Education: Alejandro Espinoza, Lisa Guillen; Renzo Bernales, Thomas Williamson, Matthew T., Halena Le • Foster Youth Services TA: Heidi Brahms, • County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA): Callie Freitag; • CDSS: Ahmed Nemr, Sara Rogers, Rebecca Buchmiller, Theresa Thurmond, Tracy Urban, Sara Davis, Fantoya Hill, Caroline Caton, Loretta Miller; Lori Fuller, • CFPIC: Stuart Oppenheim; • Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services: Patricia Armani; • Madera County Human Services: Danny Morris; Shanel Moore, • Probation: Ruda Lester, • Fresno County: Tricia Gonzalez • Butte County: Karen Ely, • SB County: Villarreal Francesca, • Health & Human Services Agency, SD: Melinda Verbon; • Sacramento County: Cynthia Vanzant; Trish Kennedy; • SELPA: Barbara Bloom, Benay Loftus, Veronica Coates, Elinsky Lori-Anne, Jim Voss, Elizabeth Engelken, Anjanette Pelletier, Tamara Clay. 	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose & Deliverables: Ahmed reminded us that we have been meeting for about 4 months; created a small task group to work on matrix of Individualized Education Plan (IEP)/ Child and family Team (CFT). Want to make sure that we are clear about what we are doing and what deliverables there might be. Any revision to purpose or additional deliverables. 	
<p>II. Discussion about supporting special needs children/youth in family settings. – Sara Rogers, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sara led a conversation about how to best serve children in home based settings. In light of the great overlap of the systems we should think about how to create an integrated system to serve all children with IEP's in out of home care system. How can we work together to think differently about the services needed in a way that decreases congregate care placements? Cited recent case of 6-year-old with IEP who was at risk of going into a group home. Are there services such as Wrap that can help keep kids in home based services? • New Jersey has a different model where mental health is making the decision about residential services---not something California is looking at. But we are looking at how we can incorporate mental health services into our systems in a more integrated way. Can we find ways to build services arrays that serve the child in a home based setting? How do we integrate educational services into the service array? CWS and MH have worked on this integration---but the question now is how we build a service array that includes educationally based services. The problem is often saying "that is your kid" • Education representatives noted that there has to be an educational need in order for educationally based services to be provided. The IEP team cannot provide services for other needs. Sara suggested that each of the systems can cite their own restrictions. • Many counties have interdisciplinary teams that work through specific cases and work together to address the needs of each child. This allows the county to provide wraparound or TBS services to keep the child at home or in a home based services. Butte and San Mateo both cited their experiences in these interdisciplinary situations. • New Jersey's crisis response process is helpful to look at as a way of responding irrespective of program eligibility. 	

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Needs Workgroup is looking at the possibility of developing a mobile crisis response process for California and that would help with education issues as well. • Since not all of the kids are in Special Ed., we need general education to participate in these discussions to help figure this out. • Funding is a huge hurdle for those children who don't meet any agency's criteria. Some counties pool resources to meet the needs of those children. • Some counties only can use wrap for Child Welfare and Probation. It would be great to use wrap for education youth. • Funds are also available through the early intervention parts of MHSA; SB 191 proposes to use these. San Mateo has done creative things to make sure that funds are flexibly used. • It is very important to acknowledge that Education has responsibility limited to those issues that impact their school functioning. Additionally, special education has an even narrower obligation to providing services to students who meet eligibility criteria. Crisis situations and home based challenges are not consistent with educational disabilities. • In San Mateo county there is a very well-functioning multidisciplinary team - similar to what Butte is describing - where they support all youth - probation, CW, FY, students with IEPs who need mental health supports beyond the school day, etc. They meet weekly and all placements go through the Interagency Placement Resource Committee to ensure continuum of care options are considered. Additionally, they have an early childhood committee as well for children 0 - 6 in partnership with their Regional Center, local hospitals, medical and mental health providers, etc. • If a region/district had a multi-tiered system of support within the educational system that provided broad based educational and social, emotional, behavioral and mental health supports to all students--which would require a huge amount of coordination and collaboration from community partners--then the needs of students might potentially be caught earlier and therefore prevented. right now these types of partnerships and collaborative effort require individuals and key stakeholders - there is nothing that is standardized even in the same region. <p>Q: How would reduction of kids in group homes affect the funding of SELPA's? A: Not yet known but may do so when the funding formula changes. We need to make sure that funding is in place for these children—need to work with the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite Lisa Witche who chairs the High Needs Workgroup to give an overview in the next meeting. Ahmed will send out the Integrated Practice Call (used to be Katie A.) information which will address the high needs work group. The next call is tomorrow 3/1/2017. • Could bring this up at RITE meetings as a best practice so that counties can consider how to appropriate funds for kids at risk of out of home placement from education. • Anjanette P. We will do a presentation on this at the CCR Ed Sub-Workgroup, the State/County Team meeting and Integrated Practice Call. • Maureen B. will send list of counties that do similar work.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	legislature to figure out how to support these children.	
III. Non-public Schools and Non-public Agencies Overview Thomas Williamson, California Department of Education	<p>Thomas gave a general background about non-public schools and residential care settings. See PowerPoint</p> <p>Q: How does this relate to requirement that children can remain in school of origin? A: May require a change in IEP. The NPS is a placement, not a school of origin.</p> <p>Q: Are there curriculum standards for NPS schools? A: Qualifications and services will be emailed out to the group along with curriculum requirements.</p> <p>Q: What about wait times? Kids sitting for a long time waiting for admission to NPS. A: Depends on who is doing the placement, whether the child has an IEP or not, the child, and often the group homes require an IEP for admission to the group home. Email questions to NPSA@cde.ca.gov</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas will email the regulations that described each related service that a nonpublic school/agency may provide, as well as the credential/licensing requirements.
IV. Out of Home Care Funding, specifically for FY 2017-18 Halena Le, School Fiscal Services Division California Department of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE and DOF kept funding formula and data from last year for this year. No change for 2017/18—already in trailer. • Process for 2018/19? DOF needs to analyze what is going on in order to make decisions about future funding process. CDE has presented some funding options. • CDE expressed the concerns of SELPA. • The Department of Finance does not know about the impact of conversion of group homes to STRTPs and do not want to do any modeling until they get a better sense of the changes. <p>Q: What is the plan for reworking this funding model moving forward? As more congregate care settings transition to STRTP and/or as more youth move to Foster Family Homes, more youth will be placed in local settings with little or no funding attached. Department of Finance continues to tell SELPA that they need to collaborate with DSS. They have been unable to gain a meeting with them on this issue, and given some of the politicized setting right now it is a challenge.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWDA could work with County Superintendents Association, statewide SELPA organization to strategize about a different funding formula. It is also good to engage the Senate Budget Committee.

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p>V. Educational Support Services (ESS) Program Patricia Armani, Department of Children and Family Services, Education Unit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patty Armani provided some information about a program in Los Angeles that she thought this group would be interested in; the program the program (Hathaway Sycamores) focuses on school of origin and school stability in least restrictive settings. CCR presents challenges to school stability by focusing on 6-month placements, which doesn't match the school year—this program helps address this by focusing on school of origin. Patty noted that they have seen great success with the program. Ventura County uses Aspiranet for similar programs. See PowerPoint. • Q: One or multiple districts? A: Multiple. • Q: When did program start? A: Closed NPS a couple of years ago. They do have impact data. • Q: How strict is the six-month placement requirement for STRTP's? • A: Yes, there is flexibility—the requirement is that there will be a review at 6 months and county justification for why a youth should be in a placement for more than 6 months. • Note: Not all counties involve education in the CFT's and Interagency Placement Committees. CDSS is issuing All County Letter to talk about why/when to involve Education in these bodies. 	
<p>VI. CFT/IEP Matrix Next Step Caroline Caton, CDSS/ Renzo Bernales, CDE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This document helps CWS know more about IEP processes and Education know about the CFT process. The matrix in addition to the IEP and the CFT process and requirement documents will be included in a joint letter between CDSS and CDE for distribution to their constituencies. See the matrix. • A 70% of education children/youth are not covered by IEP's. Some children are covered by Student Study Team (SST). Can we create a parallel document that addresses the general Ed community? Maybe a comparison document for CFT's and SST's, 504's and CFT. • We need to have some conversation about how education can be included in the CFT process that would result in an FAQ. When and how can education be involved in the CFT? Need to clarify benefits for the schools—try to sell the need/justification for staff to attend CFT's. There needs to be a joint approach to mutual understanding and mutual benefits. • Volunteers: Veronica, Renzo, Trish Kennedy, Foster Youth Education, Early 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renzo noted that the Matrix document needs a little clarification, which he will provide. • The letter needs to provide some context and clarification of the approaches to addressing the needs of children. • This could also be included in a CFT FAQ letter from CDSS. • Create a small workgroup to provide an informing document that sells to Education the value of being included in CFTs, when Education should be invited to

AGENDA ITEM	NOTES/DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>Childhood Education, Placer County Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), Student Services, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the work of this committee be posted on CDSS website? Yes, it could be a landing page for the work of this committee. 	<p>CFTs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a page on the CCR website to post the work of this sub-workgroup.
<p>VI. Next Steps Stuart Oppenheim, CFPIC Ahmed Nemr, CDSS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next meeting: Tuesday, May 2, 2017. 10-3 PM at CDSS OB 9 –Room # 203 High Needs Youth Presentation San Mateo Multidisciplinary Team Model Presentation Small Workgroup Report Out 	